

Title 16. Respiratory Care Board
Department of Consumer Affairs
[Examination Equivalency]

INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

HEARING DATE: September 15, 2004

SUBJECT MATTER OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS:

Defining examination equivalency for respiratory care practitioner applicants who have previously taken and passed a national credentialing examination and possess a valid credential.

SECTIONS AFFECTED:

Section 1399.341 of the California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 13.6, Article 4.

SPECIFIC PURPOSE OF EACH ADOPTION, AMENDMENT, OR REPEAL:

Adopt Section 1399.341 of Division 13.6 Article 4 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations to define examination equivalency for respiratory care practitioner applicants who may not be subject to the current licensing examination requirement based upon successful completion of a national examination resulting in the possession of a valid credential.

FACTUAL BASIS:

The proposed regulation will ensure that only those applicants who can demonstrate successful completion of an equivalent examination, as defined, will not be required to take and pass the current state licensing examination as part of the application process.

It is the Board's opinion that examinations deemed equivalent are either those administered based upon a current job analysis reflective of nationwide standards, or documentation supporting current licensure and/or practice which indicates knowledge of up to date practice standards. For that reason, the Board has opined that credentials earned within three years preceding the filing of an application are based on an equivalent examination. In addition, credentials issued after July 1, 2002 are subject to re-certification ensuring that an individual can document continued education consistent with current practice. Lastly, for individuals who may have earned a credential more than three years preceding application filing, but have maintained a valid license in another state and/or can document current practice, are presumably up to date with current practice standards.

UNDERLYING DATA: None

BUSINESS IMPACT: None

SPECIFIC TECHNOLOGIES OR EQUIPMENT: None necessary

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES:

No alternative which was considered would be either more effective than or equally as effective as and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed regulation.